arXiv:math/0702368v3 [math.AC] 19 Apr 2007

Toric ideals of phylogenetic invariants for the general group-based model on claw trees $K_{1,n}$

Julia Chifman, Sonja Petrović

Department of Mathematics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506, USA
{jchifman,petrovic}@ms.uky.edu

Abstract. We address the problem of studying the toric ideals of phylogenetic invariants for a general group-based model on an arbitrary claw tree. We focus on the group $\mathbb{Z}_2$ and choose a natural recursive approach that extends to other groups. The study of the lattice associated with each phylogenetic ideal produces a list of circuits that generate the corresponding lattice basis ideal. In addition, we describe *explicitly* a quadratic lexicographic Gröbner basis of the toric ideal of invariants for the claw tree on an arbitrary number of leaves. Combined with a result of Sturmfels and Sullivant, this implies that the phylogenetic ideal of *every* tree for the group $\mathbb{Z}_2$ has a quadratic Gröbner basis. Hence, the coordinate ring of the toric variety is a Koszul algebra.

Acknowledgment. The authors would like to thank Uwe Nagel for introducing us to the field of phylogenetic algebraic geometry and for his continuous support, motivation and guidance.

1 Introduction

Phylogenetics is concerned with determining genetic relationship between species based on their DNA sequences. First, the various DNA sequences are aligned, that is, a correspondence is established that accounts for their differences. Assuming that all DNA sites evolve identically and independently, the focus is on one site at a time. The data then consists of observed pattern frequencies in aligned sequences. This observed data are used to estimate the true joint probabilities of the observations and, most importantly, to reconstruct the ancestral relationship among the species. The relationship can be represented by a phylogenetic tree.

A *phylogenetic tree* T is a simple, connected, acyclic graph equipped with some statistical information. Namely, each node of T is a random variable with k possible states chosen from the state space S. Edges of T are labeled by transition probability matrices that reflect probabilities of changes of the states from a node to its child. These probabilities of mutation are the parameters for the statistical model of evolution, which is described in terms of a discrete-state continuous-time Markov process on the tree. Since the goal is to reconstruct the tree, the interior nodes are hidden. The relationship between the random

variables is encoded by the structure of the tree. At each of the n leaves, we can observe any of the k states; thus there are k^n possible observations. Let p_σ be the joint probability of making a particular observation $\sigma \subset S^n$ at the leaves. Then p_σ is a polynomial in the model parameters.

A *phylogenetic invariant* of the model is a polynomial in the leaf probabilities which vanishes for every choice of model parameters. The set of these polynomials forms a prime ideal in the polynomial ring over the unknowns p_σ. The objective is to compute this ideal explicitly. Thus we consider a polynomial map $\phi : \mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{C}^{k^n}$, where N is the total number of model parameters. The map depends only on the tree T and the number of states k; its coordinate functions are the k^n polynomials p_σ. The map ϕ induces a parametrization of an algebraic variety. The study of these algebraic varieties for various statistical models is a central theme in the field of algebraic statistics ([11]). Phylogenetic invariants are a powerful tool for tree reconstruction ([2], [3], [7]).

There is a specific class of models for which the ideal of invariants is particularly nice. Let M_e be the $k \times k$ transition probability matrix for edge e of T. In the general Markov model, each matrix entry is an independent model parameter. A group-based model is one in which the matrices M_e are pairwise distinct, but it is required that certain entries coincide. For these models, transition matrices are diagonalizable by the Fourier transform of an abelian group. The key idea behind this linear change of coordinates is to label the states (for example, A,C,G, and T) by a finite abelian group (for example, $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$) in such a way that transition from one state to another depends only on the difference of the group elements. Examples of group-based models include the Jukes-Cantor and Kimura's one-parameter models used in computational biology.

Sturmfels and Sullivant in [11] reduce the computation of ideals of phylogenetic invariants of group-based models on an arbitrary tree to the case of claw trees $T_n := K_{1,n}$, the complete bipartite graph from one node (the root) to n nodes (the leaves). The main result of [11] gives a way of constructing the ideal of phylogenetic invariants for any tree *if* the ideal for the claw tree is known. However, in general, it is an open problem to compute the phylogenetic invariants for a claw tree. We consider the ideal for a general group-based model for the group $\mathbb{Z}_2$. Let q_σ be the image of p_σ under the Fourier transform. Assuming the identity labeling function and adopting the notation of [11], the ideal of phylogenetic invariants for the tree T_n is the kernel of the following homomorphism between polynomial rings:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_n : \mathbb{C}[q_{g_1,\ldots,g_n} : g_1, \ldots, g_n \in G] &\to \mathbb{C}[a_g^{(i)} : g \in G, i = 1, \ldots, n+1] \\ q_{g_1,\ldots,g_n} &\mapsto a_{g_1}^{(1)} a_{g_2}^{(2)} \ldots a_{g_n}^{(n)} a_{g_1+g_2+\cdots+g_n}^{(n+1)}, \qquad (*) \end{aligned}$$

where G is a finite group with k elements, each corresponding to a state. The coordinate $q_{g_1,\ldots,g_n}$ corresponds to observing the element g_1 at the first leaf of T, g_2 at the second, and so on. The phylogenetic invariants form a *toric ideal* in the Fourier coordinates q_σ, which can be computed from the corresponding lattice basis ideal by saturation. The main result of this paper is a complete description

of the lattice basis ideal and a quadratic Gröbner basis of the ideal of invariants for the group $\mathbb{Z}_2$ on T_n for any number of leaves n.

Our paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we lay the foundation for our recursive approach. The ideal of the two-leaf claw tree is trivial, so we begin with the case when the number of leaves is three. Sections 3 and 4 address the problem of describing the lattices corresponding to the toric ideals. We provide a nice lattice basis consisting of circuits. The corresponding lattice basis ideal is generated by circuits of degree two and thus in particular satisfies the Sturmfels-Sullivant conjecture.

The ideal of phylogenetic invariants is the saturation of the lattice basis ideal. However, we do not use any of the standard algorithms to compute saturation (e.g. [8], [10]). Instead, our recursive construction of the lattice basis ideals can be extended to give the full ideal of invariants, which we describe in the final section. The recursive description of these ideals depends only on the number of leaves of the claw tree and it does not require saturation. Finally, and possibly somewhat surprisingly, we show that the ideal of invariants for every claw tree admits a quadratic Gröbner basis with respect to a lexicographic term order. We describe it *explicitly*.

Combined with the main result of Sturmfels and Sullivant in [11], this implies that the phylogenetic ideal of *every* tree for the group $\mathbb{Z}_2$ has a quadratic Gröbner basis. Hence, the coordinate ring of the toric variety is a Koszul algebra. In addition, the ideals for every tree can be computed explicitly. These ideals are particularly nice as they satisfy the conjecture in [11] which proposes that the order of the group gives an upper bound for the degrees of minimal generators of the ideal of invariants. The case of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ has been solved in [11] using a technique that does not generalize. We hope to extend our recursive approach and obtain the result for an arbitrary abelian group.

For a detailed background on phylogenetic trees, invariants, group-based models, Fourier coordinates, labeling functions and more, the reader should refer to [1], [6], [9], [11].

2 Matrix representation

Fix a claw tree T_n on n leaves and a finite abelian group G of order k. Soon we will specialize to the case $k = 2$. We want to compute the ideal of phylogenetic invariants for the general group-based model on T_n. After the Fourier transform, the ideal of invariants (in Fourier coordinates) is given by $I_n = \ker \varphi_n$, where φ_n is a map between polynomial rings in k^n and $k(n+1)$ variables, respectively, defined by (*). In order to compute the toric ideal I_n, we first compute the lattice basis ideal $I_{L_n} \subset I_n$ corresponding to φ_n as follows. Fixing an order on the monomials of the two polynomial rings, the linear map φ can be represented by a matrix $B_{n,k}$ that describes the action of φ on the variables. Then the lattice $L_n = \ker(B_{n,k}) \subset \mathbb{Z}^{k^n}$ determines the ideal I_{L_n}. It is generated by elements of the form $(\prod q_{g_1,\ldots,g_n})^{v^+} - (\prod q_{g_1,\ldots,g_n})^{v^-}$ where $v = v^+ - v^- \in L_n$. We will give an explicit description of this basis and, equivalently, the ideals I_{L_n}.

Hereafter assume that $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$. For simplicity, let us say that $B_n := B_{n,2}$.

To create the matrix B_n, first order the two bases as follows. Order the $a_g^{(i)}$ by varying the upper index (i) first and then the group element g: $a_0^{(1)}$, $a_0^{(2)}$, $\ldots$, $a_0^{(n+1)}$, $a_1^{(1)}$, $\ldots$, $a_1^{(n+1)}$. Then, order the $q_{g_1,\ldots,g_n}$ by ordering the indices with respect to binary counting:

$$q_{0\ldots00} > q_{0\ldots01} > \cdots > q_{1\ldots10} > q_{1\ldots1}.$$

That is, $q_{g_1\ldots g_n} > q_{h_1\ldots h_n}$ if and only if $(g_1 \ldots g_n)_2 < (h_1 \ldots h_n)_2$, where

$$(g_1 \ldots g_n)_2 := g_1 2^{n-1} + g_2 2^{n-2} + \cdots + g_n 2^0$$

represents the binary number $g_1 \ldots g_n$.

Next, index the rows of B_n by $a_g^{(i)}$ and its columns by $q_{g_1,\ldots,g_n}$. Finally, put 1 in the entry of B_n in the row indexed by $a_g^{(i)}$ and column indexed by $q_{g_1,\ldots,g_n}$ if $a_g^{(i)}$ divides the image of $q_{g_1,\ldots,g_n}$, and 0 otherwise.

Example 1. Let $n = 2$. Then we order the q_{ij} variables according to binary counting: q_{00}, q_{01}, q_{10}, q_{11}, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi : \mathbb{C}[q_{00}, q_{01}, q_{10}, q_{11}] &\to \mathbb{C}[a_0^{(1)}, a_0^{(2)}, a_0^{(3)}, a_1^{(1)}, a_1^{(2)}, a_1^{(3)}] \\
q_{00} &\mapsto a_0^{(1)} a_0^{(2)} a_{0+0}^{(3)} \\
q_{01} &\mapsto a_0^{(1)} a_1^{(2)} a_{0+1}^{(3)} \\
q_{10} &\mapsto a_1^{(1)} a_0^{(2)} a_{1+0}^{(3)} \\
q_{11} &\mapsto a_1^{(1)} a_1^{(2)} a_{1+1}^{(3)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we put the $a_i^{(j)}$ variables in order: $a_0^{(1)}$, $a_0^{(2)}$, $a_0^{(3)}$, $a_1^{(1)}$, $a_1^{(2)}$, $a_1^{(3)}$. Thus

$$B_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1&1&0&0 \\ 1&0&1&0 \\ 1&0&0&1 \\ 0&0&1&1 \\ 0&1&0&1 \\ 0&1&1&0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The tree T_{n-1} can be considered as a subtree of T_n by ignoring, for example, the leftmost leaf of T. As a consequence, a natural question arises: how does B_n relate to B_{n-1}?

Remark 1. The matrix B_{n-1} for the subtree of T_n with the leaf (1) removed can be obtained as a submatrix of B_n for the tree T_n by deleting rows 1 and $(n+1)+1$ and taking only the first 2^{n-1} columnns.
Divide the n-leaf matrix B_n into a 2×2 block matrix with blocks of size $(n+1) \times 2^{n-1}$:

$$B_n = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, grouping together B_{11}, B_{21} without the first row of each B_{i1}, we obtain the matrix B_{n-1}. This is true because rows 1 and $(n+1)+1$ represent the variables $a_g^{(1)}$ for $g \in G$ associated with the leaf (1) of T_n. Note that the entries in row $a_g^{(n+1)}$ remain undisturbed as the omitted rows are indexed by the identity of the group.

Example 2. The matrix B_2 is equal to the submatrix of B_3 formed by rows 2,3,4,6,7,8, and first 4 columns.

Remark 2. Fix any observation $\sigma = g_1, \ldots, g_n$ on the leaves. Clearly, at any given leaf $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, we observe exactly one group element, g_j. Since the matrix entry $b_{a_{g_j}^{(j)}, q_\sigma}$ in the row indexed by $a_{g_j}^{(j)}$ and column indexed by q_σ is 1 exactly when $a_{g_j}^{(j)}$ divides the image of q_σ, one has that

$$\sum_{g_j \in G} b_{a_{g_j}^{(j)}, q_\sigma} = 1$$

for a fixed leaf (j) and fixed observation σ. Note that the formula also holds if $j = n+1$ by definition of $a_{g_{n+1}}^{(n+1)} = a_{g_1 + \cdots + g_n}^{(n+1)}$. In particular, the rows indexed by $a_{g_j}^{(j)}$ for a fixed j sum up to the row of ones.

3 Number of lattice basis elements

We compute the dimension of the kernel of B_n by induction on n. We proceed in two steps.

Lemma 1 (Lower bound).

$$\operatorname{rank}(B_n) \geq \operatorname{rank}(B_{n-1}) + 1.$$

Proof. First note that $\operatorname{rank}(B_n) \geq \operatorname{rank}(B_{n-1})$ since B_{n-1} is a submatrix of the first 2^{n-1} columns of B_n. In the block $\left[B_{11}, B_{12}\right]^T$, the row indexed by $a_1^{(1)}$ is zero, while in the block $\left[B_{21}, B_{22}\right]^T$, the row indexed by $a_1^{(1)}$ is 1. Choosing one column from $\left[B_{21}, B_{22}\right]^T$ provides a vector independent of the first 2^{n-1} columns. The rank must therefore increase by at least 1. □

Lemma 2 (Upper bound).

$$\operatorname{rank}(B_n) \leq n + 2.$$

Proof. B_n has $2(n+1)$ rows. Remark 2 provides n independent relations among the rows of our matrix: varying j from 1 to $n+1$, we obtain that the sum of the rows j and $n+1+j$ is 1 for each $j = 1, \ldots, n+1$. Thus the upper bound is immediate. □

We are ready for the main result of the section.

Proposition 1 (Cardinality of lattice basis).
Let $n \geq 2$. Then there are $2^n - 2(n+1) + n$ elements in the basis of the lattice L_n corresponding to T_n. That is,

$$\dim \ker(B_n) = 2^n - 2(n+1) + n.$$

Proof. We show $\operatorname{rank}(B_n) = 2(n+1) - n$. It can be checked directly that B_2 has full rank. Assume that the claim is true for $n-1$. Then by Lemmae (1) and (2),

$$2(n+1) - n \geq \operatorname{rank}(B_n) \geq \operatorname{rank}(B_{n-1}) + 1 = 2n - (n-1) + 1,$$

where the last equality is provided by the induction hypothesis. The claim follows since the left- and the right-hand sides agree. □

4 Lattice basis

In this section we describe a basis of the kernel of $B_n := B_{n,2}$, in which the binomials corresponding to the basis elements satisfy the conjecture on the degrees of the generators of the phylogenetic ideal. In particular, since the ideal is generated by squarefree binomials and contains no linear forms, these elements are actually circuits. By Proposition 1, we need to find $2^n - (n+2)$ linearly independent vectors in the lattice. The matrix of the tree with $n = 2$ leaves has a trivial kernel, so we begin with the tree on $n = 3$ leaves. The dimension of the kernel is 3 and the lattice basis is given by the rows of the following matrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In order to study the kernels of B_n for any n, it is useful to have an algorithmic way of constructing the matrices.

Algorithm 1 [The construction of B_n]
Input: the number of leaves n of the claw tree T_n.
Output: $B_n \in \mathbb{Z}^{2(n+1)\times 2^n}$.
Initialize B_n to the zero matrix.
Construct the first n rows:
 for k from 1 to n do:
  for c from 0 to $2^k - 1$ with $c \equiv 0 \mod 2$ do:
   for j from $c2^{n-k} + 1$ to $(c+1)2^{n-k}$ do: $b_{k,j} := 1$.
Construct row $n+1$:
 if $n \equiv (\sum_{r=1}^{n} b_{r,j}) \mod 2$, then $b_{n+1,j} := 1$.
Construct rows $n+2$ to $2(n+1)$:
 for i from 1 to $n+1$ do:
  for j from 1 to 2^n do: $b_{n+1+i}, j := 1 - b_{i,j}$.

One checks that this algorithm gives indeed the matrices B_n as defined in Section 3.

The $(n+1+i)^{th}$ row r_{n+1+i} of B_n is by definition the binary complement of the i^{th} row r_i of B_n. Suppose that $r_i \cdot k = 0$ for some vector k. Since all entries of B_n are nonnegative, a subvector of k restricted to the entries where r_i is nonzero must be homogeneous in the sense that the sum of the positive entries equals the sum of the negative entries. But since the ideal I_{L_n} itself is homogeneous ([10]), the same must be true for the subvector of k restricted to the entries where r_i is zero. Hence $r_{n+1+i} \cdot k = 0$. Therefore, it is enough to analyze the top half of the matrix B_n when determining the kernel elements.

Remark 3. There are n copies of B_{n-1} inside B_n.
By deleting one leaf at a time, we get n copies of T_{n-1} as a subtree of T_n. Suppose we delete leaf (i) from T_n to get the tree $T_n^{(i)}$ on leaves $1, 2, \ldots, i-1, i+1, \ldots, n$. Ignoring the two rows of B_n that represent the leaf (i) and taking into account the columns of B_n containing nonzero entries of the row indexed by $a_0^{(i)}$ (that is, observing 0 at leaf (i)) gives precisely the matrix B_{n-1} corresponding to $T_n^{(i)}$. Note that the entry indexed by $a_g^{(n+1)}$, for any $g \in G$, will be correct since we are ignoring the identity of the group, as in Remark 1.

This leads to a way of constructing a basis of $\ker(B_n)$ from the one of $\ker(B_{n-1})$. Namely, removing leaf (1) from T_n produces $\dim(\ker(B_{n-1})) = 2^{n-1} - n - 1$ independent vectors in $\ker(B_n)$. Let us name this collection of vectors V_1. Removing leaf (2) produces a collection V_2 consisting of $\dim(\ker B_{n-1}) - \dim(\ker B_{n-2}) = 2^{n-2} - 1$ vectors in $\ker(B_n)$. V_2 is independent of V_1 since the second half of each vector in V_2 has nonzero entries in the columns of B_n where all vectors in V_1 are zero, a direct consequence of the location of the submatrix corresponding to $T_n^{(2)}$. Finally, removing any other leaf (i) of T_n produces a collection V_i of as many new kernel elements as there are new columns involved (in terms of the submatrix structure); namely, 2^{n-i} new vectors. Note that every vector in V_2 has a nonzero entry in at least one new column so that the full collection is independent of V_1.

Using the above procedure, we have obtained

$$(2^{n-1} - n - 1) + (2^{n-2} - 1) + (2^{n-3}) + \cdots + 2^{n-n}$$

independent vectors in the kernel of B_n. This is exactly one less than the desired number, $2^n - n - 2$. Hence to the list of the kernel generators we add one additional vector v that is independent of all the V_i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ as it has a nonnegative entry in the last column. (Note that no $v \in V_i$ has this property by the observation on the column location of the submatrix associated with each $T_n^{(i)}$.) In particular, $v = [0, \ldots, 0, 1, 0, 0, -1, -1, 0, 0, 1] \in \ker(B_n)$. To see this, we simply notice that the rows of the last 8-column block of B_n are precisely the rows of the first 8-column block of B_n up to permutation of rows, which does not affect the kernel.

The lattice basis we just constructed is directly computed by the following algorithm.

Algorithm 2 [Construction of the lattice basis for T_n]
Input: the number of leaves n of the claw tree T_n.
Output: a basis of $\ker B_n$ in form of a $(2^n - n - 2) \times 2^n$ matrix L_n.
Let $L_3 := \begin{bmatrix} 0\,0\,1\,-1\,-1\,1\,0\,0 \\ 0\,1\,0\,-1\,-1\,0\,1\,0 \\ 1\,0\,0\,-1\,-1\,0\,0\,1 \end{bmatrix}$.
Set $k := 4$.
The following subroutine lifts L_{k-1} to L_k:
WHILE $k \leq n$ do:{
Initialize L_k to the zero matrix.
For i from 1 to k do:
  $\text{cols}(i) := \{1..2^{k-i}, (2)2^{k-i} + 1..(3)2^{k-i}, \ldots, (2^i - 2)2^{k-i} + 1..(2^i - 1)2^{k-i}\}$.
Denote by $L_{k,j}[\text{cols}(i)]$ the j^{th} row vector of L_k restricted to columns $\text{cols}(i)$.
Set $i := 1$:
  for j from 1 to $2^{k-1} - k - 1$ do: $\quad L_{k,j}[\text{cols}(i)] := L_{k-1,j}$.
Set $i := 2$:
  for j from 1 to $2^{k-2} - 1$ do :
  $L_{k,(2^{k-1}-k-1)+j}[\text{cols}(i)] := L_{k-1,(2^{k-1}-k-1)-(2^{k-2}-1)+j}$.
For i from 3 to k do:
  for j from 1 to 2^{k-i} do:
  $L_{k,(2^k-2^{k+1-i}-k-2)+j}[\text{cols}(i)] := L_{k-1,(2^{k-1}-k-1)-(2^{k-i})+j}$.
Finally, $L_{k,2^k-k-2}[2^k - 7..2^k] := [1, 0, 0, -1, -1, 0, 0, 1]$.
RETURN L_k. }

Example 3. Consider the tree on $n = 4$ leaves. Then

$$B_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 1\,1\,1\,1\,1\,1\,1\,1\,0\,0\,0\,0\,0\,0\,0\,0 \\ 1\,1\,1\,1\,0\,0\,0\,0\,1\,1\,1\,1\,0\,0\,0\,0 \\ 1\,1\,0\,0\,1\,1\,0\,0\,1\,1\,0\,0\,1\,1\,0\,0 \\ 1\,0\,1\,0\,1\,0\,1\,0\,1\,0\,1\,0\,1\,0\,1\,0 \\ 1\,0\,0\,1\,0\,1\,1\,0\,0\,1\,1\,0\,1\,0\,0\,1 \\ 0\,0\,0\,0\,0\,0\,0\,0\,1\,1\,1\,1\,1\,1\,1\,1 \\ 0\,0\,0\,0\,1\,1\,1\,1\,0\,0\,0\,0\,1\,1\,1\,1 \\ 0\,0\,1\,1\,0\,0\,1\,1\,0\,0\,1\,1\,0\,0\,1\,1 \\ 0\,1\,0\,1\,0\,1\,0\,1\,0\,1\,0\,1\,0\,1\,0\,1 \\ 0\,1\,1\,0\,1\,0\,0\,1\,1\,0\,0\,1\,0\,1\,1\,0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The lattice basis is given by the rows of the following matrix:

$$L_4 = \begin{bmatrix}
0&0&1&-1&-1&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\
0&1&0&-1&-1&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\
1&0&0&-1&-1&0&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\
0&0&1&-1&0&0&0&0&-1&1&0&0&0&0&0&0\\
0&1&0&-1&0&0&0&0&-1&0&1&0&0&0&0&0\\
1&0&0&-1&0&0&0&0&-1&0&0&1&0&0&0&0\\
0&1&0&0&0&-1&0&0&-1&0&0&0&1&0&0&0\\
1&0&0&0&0&-1&0&0&-1&0&0&0&0&1&0&0\\
1&0&0&0&0&0&-1&0&-1&0&0&0&0&0&1&0\\
0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&0&0&-1&-1&0&0&1
\end{bmatrix}.$$

The lattice vectors correspond to the relations on the leaf observations in the natural way; namely, the first column corresponds to $q_{0,\ldots,0}$, the second to $q_{0,\ldots,0,1}$, and so on. Therefore, the lattice basis ideal for T_4 in Fourier coordinates is

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{L_4} = (&q_{0010}q_{0101} - q_{0011}q_{0100}, q_{0001}q_{0110} - q_{0011}q_{0100}, q_{0000}q_{0111} - q_{0011}q_{0100},\\
&q_{0010}q_{1001} - q_{0011}q_{1000}, q_{0001}q_{1010} - q_{0011}q_{1000}, q_{0000}q_{1011} - q_{0011}q_{1000},\\
&q_{0001}q_{1100} - q_{0101}q_{1000}, q_{0000}q_{1101} - q_{0101}q_{1000},\\
&q_{0000}q_{1110} - q_{0110}q_{1000}, q_{1000}q_{1111} - q_{1011}q_{1100}).
\end{aligned}$$

This ideal is contained in the ideal of phylogenetic invariants I_4 for T_4. In the next section, we compute explicitly the generators of the ideal of invariants for any claw three T_n and the group $\mathbb{Z}_2$.

5 Ideal of invariants

We show that the lattice basis ideals provide basic building blocks for the full ideals of invariants, as expected. However, instead of computing the ideal of invariants as a saturation of the lattice basis ideal in a standard way (e.g. [8],[10]), we use the recursive constructions from the previous section on the saturated ideals directly. We begin with the ideal of invariants for the smallest tree, and build all other trees recursively. The underlying ideas for how to lift the generating sets come from Algorithm 2.
We will denote the ideal of the claw tree on n leaves by $I_n = \ker \varphi_n$. As we have seen, the first nontrivial ideal is I_3.

5.1 The tree on $n = 3$ leaves

Claim. The ideal of the claw tree on $n = 3$ leaves is

$$I_3 = (q_{000}q_{111} - q_{100}q_{011}, q_{001}q_{110} - q_{100}q_{011}, q_{010}q_{101} - q_{100}q_{011}).$$

This can be verified by computation. In particular, this ideal is equal to the lattice basis ideal for the tree on three leaves; I_{L_3} is already prime in this case.

Let $<:=<_{lex}$ be the lexicographic order on the variables induced by

$$q_{000} > q_{001} > q_{010} > q_{011} > q_{100} > q_{101} > q_{110} > q_{111}.$$

(That is, $q_{ijk} > q_{i'j'k'}$ if and only if $(ijk)_2 < (i'j'k')_2$, where $(ijk)_2$ denotes the binary number ijk.)

Remark 4. The three generators of I_3 above are a Gröbner basis for I_3 with respect to $<$, since the initial terms, written with coefficient $+1$ in the above description, are relatively prime so all the S-paris reduce to zero.

Remark 5. Write the quadratic binomial $q = q^+ - q^-$ as

$$q_{g_1^{(1)}g_1^{(2)}g_1^{(3)}}q_{g_2^{(1)}g_2^{(2)}g_2^{(3)}} - q_{h_1^{(1)}h_1^{(2)}h_1^{(3)}}q_{h_2^{(1)}h_2^{(2)}h_2^{(3)}}.$$

Then $q \in I_3$ if and only if the following two conditions hold:

1. Exchanging the roles of $q_{h_1^{(1)}h_1^{(2)}h_1^{(3)}}$ and $q_{h_2^{(1)}h_2^{(2)}h_2^{(3)}}$ if necessary,

$$g_1^{(1)} + g_1^{(2)} + g_1^{(3)} = h_1^{(1)} + h_1^{(2)} + h_1^{(3)}$$

and

$$g_2^{(1)} + g_2^{(2)} + g_2^{(3)} = h_2^{(1)} + h_2^{(2)} + h_2^{(3)},$$

2. $g_1^{(i)} + g_2^{(i)} = 1 = h_1^{(i)} + h_2^{(i)}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3 = n$.

Note that the second condition holds since otherwise the projection of q obtained by eliminating the leaf (i) at which the observations $g_1^{(i)}$ and $g_2^{(i)}$ are both equal to 0 or to 1 produces an element q' in the kernel of the map φ_2 of the 2-leaf tree, which is trivial.

5.2 The tree on an arbitrary number of leaves

Let us now define a set of maps and a distinguished set of binomials in I_n.

Definition 1. *Let $\pi_i(q)$ be the projection of q that eliminates the i^{th} index of each variable in q.*

For example,

$$\pi_4(q_{0000}q_{1110} - q_{1000}q_{0110}) = q_{000}q_{111} - q_{100}q_{011}.$$

Definition 2. *Assume that $n \geq 4$.*

Let $\mathcal{G}_n$ be the set of quadratic binomials $q \in I_n$ that can be written as

$$q = q^+ - q^- = q_{g_1^{(1)}\ldots g_1^{(n)}}q_{g_2^{(1)}\ldots g_2^{(n)}} - q_{h_1^{(1)}\ldots h_1^{(n)}}q_{h_2^{(1)}\ldots h_2^{(n)}}$$

such that one of the two following properties is satisfied:

Property (i): For some $1 \leq i \leq n$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_2$,

$$g_1^{(i)} = g_2^{(i)} = j = h_1^{(i)} = h_2^{(i)} \tag{1}$$

and

$$\pi_i(q) \in I_{n-1}. \tag{2}$$

Property (ii): For each $1 \leq k \leq n$,

$$g_1^{(k)} + g_2^{(k)} = 1 = h_1^{(k)} + h_2^{(k)} \tag{3}$$

and

$$\pi_k(q) \in I_{n-1}. \tag{4}$$

Example 4. Let $n = 4$. The set of elements $q \in \mathcal{G}_n$ with Property (i) consists of those for which $j = 0$:
$q_{0000}q_{0111} - q_{0100}q_{0011}$, $q_{0001}q_{0110} - q_{0100}q_{0011}$, $q_{0010}q_{0101} - q_{0100}q_{0011}$,
$q_{0000}q_{1011} - q_{1000}q_{0011}$, $q_{0001}q_{1010} - q_{1000}q_{0011}$, $q_{0010}q_{1001} - q_{1000}q_{0011}$,
$q_{0000}q_{1101} - q_{1000}q_{0101}$, $q_{0001}q_{1100} - q_{1000}q_{0101}$, $q_{0100}q_{1001} - q_{1000}q_{0101}$,
$q_{0000}q_{1110} - q_{1000}q_{0110}$, $q_{0010}q_{1100} - q_{1000}q_{0110}$, $q_{0100}q_{1010} - q_{1000}q_{0110}$;
and those for which $j = 1$:
$q_{1000}q_{1111} - q_{1100}q_{1011}$, $q_{1001}q_{1110} - q_{1100}q_{1011}$, $q_{1010}q_{1101} - q_{1100}q_{1011}$,
$q_{0100}q_{1111} - q_{1100}q_{0111}$, $q_{0101}q_{1110} - q_{1100}q_{0111}$, $q_{0110}q_{1101} - q_{1100}q_{0111}$,
$q_{0010}q_{1111} - q_{1010}q_{0111}$, $q_{0011}q_{1110} - q_{1010}q_{0111}$, $q_{0110}q_{1011} - q_{1010}q_{0111}$,
$q_{0001}q_{1111} - q_{1001}q_{0111}$, $q_{0011}q_{1101} - q_{1001}q_{0111}$, $q_{0101}q_{1011} - q_{1001}q_{0111}$.
The set of elements $q \in \mathcal{G}_n$ with Property (ii) are:
$q_{0000}q_{1111} - q_{1001}q_{0110}$, $q_{0001}q_{1110} - q_{1000}q_{0111}$, $q_{0011}q_{1100} - q_{1001}q_{0110}$,
$q_{0010}q_{1101} - q_{1000}q_{0111}$, $q_{0101}q_{1010} - q_{1001}q_{0110}$, $q_{0100}q_{1011} - q_{1000}q_{0111}$.

Proposition 2. *For $n \geq 4$, the set of binomials in $\mathcal{G}_n$ generates the ideal I_n. That is,*

$$I_n = (q : q^+ - q^- \in \mathcal{G}_n).$$

In addition, this set of generators can be obtained inductively by lifting the generators corresponding to the various phylogenetic ideals on $n-1$ leaves.

Proof. Condition (3) is simply the negation of (1). Condition (1) can be restated as follows: for some $1 \leq i \leq n$ and a fixed j,

$$(a_j^{(i)})^2 | \varphi_n(q^+) \text{ and } (a_j^{(i)})^2 | \varphi_n(q^-).$$

Therefore, Property (i) translates to having an observation j fixed at leaf (i) for each of the variables in q. On the other hand, condition (3) means that for any k, not all the k^{th} indices are 0 and not all are 1. Thus Property (ii) means that no leaf has a fixed observation, and can be restated as follows: for every $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$a_0^{(i)} a_1^{(i)} | \varphi_n(q^+) \text{ and } a_0^{(i)} a_1^{(i)} | \varphi_n(q^-). \tag{5}$$

By definition, the ideal I_n is toric, so it is generated by binomials. In fact, it is generated by homogeneous binomials, because each row of the matrix B_n used

for defining it has row sum $n+1$ ([10], chapter 4). In addition, Sturmfels and Sullivant in [11] have shown that the ideal I_n is generated in degree 2. Hence it suffices to consider homogeneous quadratic binomials. Let $q = q^+ - q^-$ be a binomial in I_n of degree 2. Then clearly either (1) or (3) holds; that is, either the index corresponding to one leaf is fixed for all the monomials in q, or none of them are.

In the former case, for the index i from equation (1),

$$\begin{aligned} q \in I_n &\iff \varphi_n(q^+) = \varphi_n(q^-) \\ &\iff \varphi_{n-1}(\pi_i(q^+)) = \varphi_{n-1}(\pi_i(q^-)) \iff \pi_i(q) \in I_{n-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first statement holds by definition of φ_n and the second by definition of the projection π_i.

In the latter case, for each i with $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} q \in I_n &\iff \varphi_n(q^+) = \varphi_n(q^-) \\ &\iff \varphi_{n-1}(\pi_i(q^+)) = \varphi_{n-1}(\pi_i(q^-)) \iff \pi_i(q) \in I_{n-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second statement holds by definition of π_i and (5). It follows that $I_n = (q : q \in \mathcal{G}_n)$.

In particular, the set of generators for I_n with Property (i) can be obtained from those of I_{n-1} by inserting first 0 at the i^{th} index position for each monomial of $q \in \mathcal{G}_{n-1}$ and then repeating the same process by inserting 1. This operation corresponds to lifting to all the possible preimages of $\pi_i(q)$ that satisfy Property (i) for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and every $q \in \mathcal{G}_{n-1}$. The set of generators for I_n with Property (ii) can be obtained from those of I_{n-1} by a similar lifting to all preimages of $\pi_i(q)$ for each $q \in \mathcal{G}_{n-1}$ in such a way that Property (ii) is satisfied. Namely, for every $q = q^+ - q^- \in \mathcal{G}_{n-1}$ with Property (ii), one inserts 0 at the i^{th} index position for one monomial of q^+ and for one monomial of q^-, and inserts 1 at the i^{th} index position for the remaining monomials of q^+ and q^-. In addition, by definition of Property (ii), it suffices to lift to the preimages of $\pi_n(q)$ only. □

Remark 6. A different recursion has been proposed by Sturmfels and Sullivant in [12].

Recall ([10]) that a binomial $q = q^+ - q^- \in I$ is said to be *primitive* if there exists no binomial $f = f^+ - f^- \in I$ with the property that $f^+|q^+$ and $f^-|q^-$. A *circuit* is a primitive binomial of minimal support.

Remark 7. The binomials in $\mathcal{G}_n$ are circuits of I_n, since the ideal is generated by squarefree binomials and contains no linear forms.

In general, we can describe the generators of I_n as follows: given n, begin by lifting $\mathcal{G}_3$ recursively to produce $\mathcal{G}_{n-1}$; that is, until the number of indices

of each generator reaches $n-1$. Next, lift $\mathcal{G}_{n-1}$ n times so that Property (i) is satisfied for one of the n index positions. For example,

$$q := q_{0000}q_{1111} - q_{1001}q_{0110} \in \mathcal{G}_4$$

can be lifted to a generator of I_5 in ten different ways: by lifting to preimages of $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_5$ so that Property (i) is satisfied with either a 0 or a 1:

$$\pi_1^{-1}(q) = \{q_{00000}q_{01111} - q_{01001}q_{00110}, q_{10000}q_{11111} - q_{11001}q_{10110}\},$$
$$\pi_2^{-1}(q) = \{q_{00000}q_{10111} - q_{10001}q_{00110}, q_{01000}q_{11111} - q_{11001}q_{01110}\},$$

and so on. This will be the set of binomials in $\mathcal{G}_n$ with Property (i). Clearly, some generators will repeat during the recursive lifting: lifting by inserting 0 at position (i) allows the 0 to occur at the previous $i-1$ positions. Also, fixing 1 at any leaf allows 0 to appear on any of the other leaves.

To construct $q^+ - q^-$ with Property (ii), we need not proceed inductively, as all projections of binomials that satisfy this property must satisfy it, too. Instead, we consider two cases corresponding to the parity of n. Namely, recalling the definition of Property (ii), first we fix q^- in such a way to ensure that $in_{<_{lex}}(q) = q^+$.

Suppose n is odd. Fix q^- by taking

$$q^- = q_{01\ldots1}q_{10\ldots0}$$

with n indices in each of the two variables. Then $n-1$ being even provides that $a_0^{(n+1)}a_1^{(n+1)}|\varphi_n(q^-)$. Thus every choice of q^+ must satisfy the same. To find q^+, we need to choose pairs of n-digit binary numbers with digits complementary to each other, and thus there are $2^{n-1}-1$ choices for q^+. Specifically, listing the smallest $2^{n-1}-1$ n-digit binary numbers and pairing them with the largest $2^{n-1}-1$ n-digit binary numbers in reverse order produces all choices for q^+, and we have a complete list of generators. For example, the first such generator in the list would be $q_{0\ldots0}q_{1\ldots1} - q_{01\ldots1}q_{10\ldots0}$.

If n is even, then we can create q^- such that $(a_0^{(n+1)})^2$ or $(a_1^{(n+1)})^2$ divides $\varphi_n(q^-)$ and $\varphi_n(q^+)$. Namely, the two choices for q^- are

$$q^- = q_{01\ldots1}q_{10\ldots0} \text{ and } q^- = q_{01\ldots10}q_{10\ldots01}.$$

The list of all possible q^+ is obtained in the manner similar to the case when n is odd, except that the odd pairs in the list receive the first choice of q^-, while the even pairs receive the second. The number of such generators $q^+ - q^-$ is $2^{n-1}-2$, since there are 2^n n-digit binary numbers and thus half as many pairs, and 2 choices are taken by the q^-.

In summary, the number of generators of I_n that satisfy Property (ii) is $(2^{n-1}-2) + (n \mod 2)$.

Next we strengthen Proposition (2).

Proposition 3. *The set $\mathcal{G}_n$ is a lexicographic Gröbner basis of I_n, for any $n \geq 4$.*

Proof. For the case $n = 3$ this is already shown. Let $n > 3$. Then we can partition the set of $q \in \mathcal{G}_n$ into those satisfying Property (i) or (ii). Note that I_n is prime by definition, and thus radical. Also, Proposition (2) shows it is generated by squarefree quadratic binomials. These facts are used in what follows.

Let q_i,$q_j \in I_n$. If $(q_i^+, q_j^+) = 1$, the S-pair $S(q_i, q_j)$ reduces to zero. Also, if q_i^- and q_j^- are not relatively prime, the cancellation criterion provides that the corresponding S-pair also reduces to zero. Therefore we consider $f := S(q_i, q_j) \in I_n$ with $(q_i^+, q_j^+) \neq 1$ and $(q_i^-, q_j^-) = 1$. In particular, $\deg(f) = 3$. Let us write $q_i = q_{g_1}q_{g_2} - q_{h_1}q_{h_2}$ and $q_j = q_{g_1}q_{g_3} - q_{h_3}q_{h_4}$. Then

$$f = q_{g_3}q_{h_1}q_{h_2} - q_{g_2}q_{h_3}q_{h_4} \in I_n.$$

Case I. Suppose q_i satisfies Property (i) and q_j satisfies Property (ii). Then there exists a k such that $\pi_k(q_i) \in I_{n-1}$. Furthermore, Property (ii) implies that $\pi_k(q_j) \in I_{n-1}$. A very technical argument shows that

$$\pi_k(f) \in I_{n-1}$$

and furthermore, this projection preserves the initial terms. In summary, to check that $\pi_k(f) \in I_{n-1}$, it suffices to ensure that $a_s^{(n)} | \varphi_{n-1}(\pi_k(q_{g_3}q_{h_1}q_{h_2}))$ if and only if $a_s^{(n)} | \varphi_{n-1}(\pi_k(q_{g_2}q_{h_3}q_{h_4}))$, where s is the sum of the observations on the leaves of the $(n-1)$-leaf tree obtained from T by deleting leaf (k). There are two cases corresponding to the parity of n. If n is odd, there are additional subcases determined by the correspondence of the images of the variables in the two monomials of f under φ_{n-1}. The facts that q_i and q_j satisfy Properties (i) and (ii), respectively, play a crucial role in the argument. Checking all the cases then shows that $\pi_k(f) \in I_{n-1}$ and that initial terms are preserved under this projection.

Applying the induction hypothesis then finishes the proof.

Case II. Suppose both q_i and q_j satisfy Property (i). Then there is a $q_k \in \mathcal{G}_n$ satisfying Property (ii) where both $S(q_i, q_k)$ and $S(q_j, q_k)$ reduce to zero. The three-pair criterion ([8]) provides the desired result.

Case III. If both q_i and q_j satisfy Property (ii), then it can be seen from the construction preceding this Proposition that the initial terms are relatively prime, so their S-polynomial need not be considered. □

Proposition 3 has important theoretical consequences. Let S be a polynomial ring over the field K. Recall ([4]) that S/I is *Koszul* if the field K has a linear resolution as a graded S/I-module:

$$\cdots \to (S/I)^{\beta_2}(-2) \to (S/I)^{\beta_1}(-1) \to S/I \to K \to 0.$$

An ideal $I \subset S$ is said to be quadratic if it is generated by quadrics. S/I is *quadratic* if its defining ideal I is quadratic, and it is *G-quadratic* if I has a quadratic Gröbner basis. It is known (e.g. [4]) that if S/I is G-quadratic, then it is Koszul, which in turn implies it is quadratic. The reverse implications do not hold in general. We have just found an infinite family of toric varieties whose coordinate rings S/I are G-quadratic.

Corollary 1. *The coordinate ring of the toric variety whose defining ideal is I_n is Koszul for every n.*

The approach developed here produces the list of generators for the kernel of B_n all of which are of degree two. In addition, by constructing the toric ideals of invariants inductively, we are able to explicitly calculate the quadratic Gröbner bases. In light of the conjecture posed in [11] that the ideal of phylogenetic invariants for the group of order k is generated in degree at most k, we are working on generalizing the above approach to any abelian group of order k. In particular, we want to give a description of the lattice basis ideal I_{L_n} and the ideal of invariants I for $G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ with generators of degree at most 4. These phylogenetic ideals are of interest to computational biologists.

References

1. E. Allman, J. Rhodes: Phylogenetic ideals and varieties for the general Markov model. Advances in Applied Mathematics, to appear. Preprint, arXiv.org:math/0410604, 2004.
2. E. Allman, J. Rhodes: Identifying evolutionary trees and substitution parameters for the general Markov model with invariable sites. Preprint, arXiv.org:q-bio/0702050, 2007.
3. M. Casanellas, J. Fernandez-Sanchez: Performance of a new invariants method on homogeneous and non-homogeneous quartet trees. Preprint, arXiv.org:q-bio/0610030, 2006.
4. A. Conca, M.E. Rossi, G. Valla: Gröbner flags and Gorenstein algebras. Compositio Math. **129** (27), Number 1, October 2001, pp. 95–121
5. D. Eisenbud: Commutative algebra with a view toward algebraic geometry. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 150, Springer-Verlag, 1995.
6. N. Eriksson, K. Ranestad, B. Sturmfels, S. Sullivant: Phylogenetic Algebraic Geometry. In: Projective varieties with unexpected properties, (editors C. Ciliberto, A. Geramita, B. Harbourne, R-M. Roig and K. Ranestad), De Gruyter, Berlin, 2005, pp. 237-255
7. N. Eriksson, Y. Yao: Metric learning for phylogenetic invariants. Preprint, arXiv.org:q-bio/0703034, 2007.
8. R. Hemmecke, P. Malkin: Computing generating sets of lattice ideals. Preprint, arXiv.org:math/0508359, 2005
9. L. Pachter, B. Sturmfels: Algebraic statistics for computational biology. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2005
10. B. Sturmfels: Gröbner bases and convex polytopes. American Mathematical Society, University Lecture Series **8**, 1996
11. B. Sturmfels, S. Sullivant: Toric ideals of phylogenetic invariants. J. Comp. Biol. **12** (2005), pp. 204-228.
12. B. Sturmfels, S. Sullivant: Toric geometry of cuts and splits. Preprint, arXiv.org:math.AC/0606683, 2006.